

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed September 7, 2005. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1, 3 – 9, 11 – 13, 24, 26 and 29 - 33 remain pending. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 1, 13 and 24, and have canceled claims 10, 14 – 23, 34 and 35 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants have canceled claims 10, 14 – 23, 34 and 35 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action indicates that claims 1, 9 – 14 and 16 - 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Levine* in view of *Yeung* in view of *Sugishima*. The Office Action also indicates that claims 24, 26, 29, 30, 34 and 35 are rejected as being unpatentable over *Duke* in view of *Yeung* in view of *Sugishima*; that claims 3, 4, 15, and 22 are rejected under as being unpatentable over *Levine* in view of *Yeung* in view of *Sugishima* and further in view of *Aiello*; that claims 5, 7, 21 and 23 are rejected as being unpatentable over *Levine* in view of *Yeung* in view of *Sugishima* and further in view of *Duke*; that claim 6 is rejected as being unpatentable over *Levine* in view of *Yeung* in view of *Sugishima* and further in view of *King*; that claims; and that claims 31 - 33 are rejected under as being unpatentable over *Duke* in view of *Yeung* in view of *Sugishima* and further in view of *Mastie*. With respect to claims 10, 14 – 23, 34 and 35, Applicants have canceled these claims and

respectfully assert that the rejections as to these claims have been rendered moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In this regard, Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the features previously recited in claim 10, and have amended claim 24 to recite features previously recited in claim 35. Therefore, since these features have been examined, Applicants respectfully request that the amendments be entered in that such amendments do not necessitate a new search or otherwise impose an undue burden on the Office.

With respect to claim 1, Applicants have amended that claim to recite:

1. A method for intelligently routing hard-copy generation tasks, comprising:
 - accessing imaging service data from a network connected computing device;
 - accessing imaging data from at least one store, via the network and using an imaging extension, to generate at least one criterion; and
 - recommending at least one hard-copy generation service capable of performing a particular hard-copy generation task matching the at least one criterion,***
wherein recommending comprises presenting a plurality of user selectable destinations.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited art, either individually or in combination, is legally deficient for the purpose of rendering claim 1 unpatentable. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that none of *Levine*, *Yeung* and *Sugishima* teaches or reasonably suggests at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 1.

In this regard, Applicants respectfully agree with the contention in the Office Action indicating that *Levine* does not teach “using an imaging extension, to generate at least one criterion; and recommending at least one hard-copy generation service capable of performing a particular hard-copy generation task matching the at least one criterion.” However, Applicants respectfully disagree that *Yeung* and *Sugishima* remedy this deficiency. Notably, *Sugishima* teaches that if “Auto” is selected, the system will determine a destination to which

a print job can be sent for printing, and then automatically sends the print job to that destination for printing. Thus, *Sagashima* does not perform “recommending at least one hard-copy generation service capable of performing a particular hard-copy generation task matching the at least one criterion, wherein recommending comprises presenting a plurality of user selectable destinations,” as recited in claim 1.

Yeung, on the other hand, appears to present all possible destinations to the user. Thus, *Yeung* also does not perform “recommending at least one hard-copy generation service capable of performing a particular hard-copy generation task matching the at least one criterion,” as recited in claim 1.

Since none of *Levine*, *Yeung* and *Sugishima* teaches or reasonably suggests at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 24, Applicants have amended that claim to recite:

24. (Currently Amended) A method for assisting a user in selecting a hardcopy generation service, comprising:
accessing imaging data stored in a personal image repository using an imaging extension;
formulating at least one criterion reflective of the imaging data;
accessing information reflective of a plurality of hardcopy generation services;
using the at least one criterion to identify hardcopy generation services;
recommending the identified hardcopy generation services to the user;
receiving a user preference; and
identifying at least one recommended service responsive to the user preference.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited art, either individually or in combination, is legally deficient for the purpose of rendering claim 24 unpatentable. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that none of *Duke*, *Yeung* and *Sugishima* teaches or reasonably suggests at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 24.

In this regard, Applicants respectfully agree with the contention in the Office Action indicating that *Duke* does not teach “accessing of imaging data” and “recommending the identified hardcopy generation services to the user,” as recited in claim 24. However, Applicants respectfully disagree that *Yeung* and *Sugishima* remedy this deficiency. Notably, *Sugishima* teaches that if “Auto” is selected, the system will determine a destination to which a print job can be sent for printing, and then automatically sends the print job to that destination for printing. Thus, *Sagashima* does not perform “recommending the identified hardcopy generation services to the user; receiving a user preference; and identifying at least one recommended service responsive to the user preference,” as recited in claim 24.

Yeung, on the other hand, appears to present all possible destinations to the user. Thus, *Yeung* also does not perform “recommending the identified hardcopy generation services to the user; receiving a user preference; and identifying at least one recommended service responsive to the user preference,” as recited in claim 24.

Since none of *Duke*, *Yeung* and *Sugishima* teaches or reasonably suggests at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 24, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 24 is in condition for allowance.

With respect to the rejection of dependent claims 3 – 9, 11 – 13, 26 and 29 - 33, Applicants respectfully assert that the secondary references of *Aiello*, *Mastie* and *King*, either individually or in combination, are legally deficient for the purpose of rendering these claims unpatentable. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the references or combinations thereof teaches or reasonably suggests at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claims 1 or 24 as lacking in the respective asserted combinations. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that these are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.


Cited Art Made of Record

The cited art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



M. Paul Qualey, Reg. No. 43,024

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on 10/28/05.



Signature